arXiv:cond-mat/0107054v2 [cond-mat.soft] 6 Jul 2001

Effects of Nonlinearity in Wave Propagation in Multicomponent Bose–Einstein Condensates

I.E.Mazets[1] *, E.V.Orlenko[2], B.G.Matisov[2],

[1] *A.F.Ioffe Physico-Technical Institute, 194021 St.Petersburg, Russia*

[2] *St.Petersburg State Technical University, 195251 St.Petersburg, Russia*

Abstract

We consider a spinor Bose-Einstein condensate in its polar ground state. We analyze magnetization waves of a finite amplitude and show that their nonlinear coupling to the density waves change the dependence of the frequency on the wavenumber dramatically. In contrary, the density wave propagation is much less modified by the nonlinearity effects. A similar phenomenon in a miscible two-component condensate is studied, too.

PACS number: 03.75.Fi

Recent advances in experimental creation of multicomponent atomic Bose–Einstein condensates [1, 2, 3] have given rise to an interest to physical properties of such systems. There are numerous works on the properties of degenerate Bose gas mixtures in magnetic traps related to both the ground state [4] and the collective excitations [5]. In Ref.[5] the early work [6] related to a homogeneous Bose gas mixture is generalized to the case of presence of external harmonic trap potential. Of course, the number of branches of the dispersion law is equal to the number of different components in a mixed BEC. Due to non-zero interaction between them, normal mode oscillations imply simultaneous mutually coherent motion of the components. In the present paper, we, however, consider firstly a multicomponent BEC of another kind, namely, a spinor BEC. Such a degenerate quantum system can be created in an optical trap, where all the atoms are confined practically independently on m_f, their momentum projection to any arbitrary axis. Such an independence of confinement on the spin orientation is a striking feature and a key advantage of an optical trap, well justified experimentally [2, 3]. Under such a condition, the spin orientation becomes a new degree of freedom. The differences and similarities between a two-component BEC with fixed m_f's for both the components and a spinor BEC in context of our study will be discussed later, at the end of this paper.

Now we have to note that in all the cited works on collective excitations in multicomponent BECs as well as in the seminal works on spinor BEC dynamics [7] oscillation amplitudes were assumed to be small enough to provide linearization of the set of coupled

*E-mail: mazets@astro.ioffe.rssi.ru

time-dependent Gross–Pitaevskii equations (GPEs). Then a proper linear transformation yields the equations of the harmonic oscillator type for the normal modes. However, the GPE is essentially nonlinear, thus the effects of finite amplitude of oscillations take place. There are some approaches to take nonlinearity into account. The first one is to find particular solutions of the GPE in a form of solitons (see, e.g., the recent work [8] and references therein). The second one is to find oscillating nonlinear solutions those in the case of infinitesimally small oscillation amplitude coincide with corresponding eigenfunctions of the linearized version of the GPE or of the equivalent set of quantum hydrodynamical equations. An elegant formalism has been developed for nonlinear oscillations of a scalar BEC in a harmonic trap in the Thomas–Fermi regime [9]. It has been found that the nonlinear effects become important, if the fraction of mass of a scalar BEC involved into oscillatory motion is comparable to unity.

In the present paper, we study validity of the approximation based on linearization of the GPE by proceeding in the following way. We consider plane waves in a spatially homogeneous multicomponent BEC. This can serve as a WKB approximation for excitations in a trapped BEC, if the excitation wavelength is much smaller than the atomic cloud size. Moreover, such an approach allows us to use in the most direct and straightforward way the standard technique of expanding a solution in series in a certain small parameter, known as a standard perturbation theory in classical mechanics [10]. Also consideration of plane waves in a translationally invariant BEC provides a possibility of comparing the results to the strict analytic formulae of Refs.[6, 7].

The main result of our work is that certain modes in a multicomponent BEC exhibit strongly nonlinear behaviour, namely, even for a relatively small wave amplitude the effects of anharmonicity become significant. This effect is absent in a scalar BEC case.

Let us consider a spinor BEC composed of atoms with the spin $f = 1$ at zero temperature. The GPE governing evolution of the complex order parameter (macroscopic wave function) $\psi(\mathbf{r}, t)$ of the BEC reads in the mean field approximation as follows [7]:

$$i\hbar\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\psi = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2M}\nabla^2\psi - \mu\psi + \hbar c_0(\tilde{\psi}^*\psi)\psi + \hbar c_2(\tilde{\psi}^*\hat{\mathbf{f}}\psi)\cdot(\hat{\mathbf{f}}\psi), \tag{1}$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{f}}$ is the single-atom angular momentum operator, a vector with Cartesian components being 3×3 matrices, M is the mass of an atom, μ is the chemical potential. Interaction constants defined as $\hbar c_0 = (g_0 + 2g_2)/3$, $\hbar c_2 = (g_2 - g_0)/3$, $g_F = 4\pi\hbar^2 a_F/M$, and a_F is the s-wave scattering length for a pair of slow atoms with the total angular momentum F equal to 0 or 2, respectively. Practically, the magnitudes of these two scattering lengths are close each to other, so $|c_2/c_0| \ll 1$. The order parameter ψ has three components, corresponding to the momentum projection to the z-axis $m_f = 0, \pm 1$:

$$\psi = \begin{pmatrix} \zeta_1 \\ \zeta_0 \\ \zeta_{-1} \end{pmatrix}\sqrt{n},$$

where n is the total equilibrium density of the BEC. $\tilde{\psi}$ means the transposed vector. In other words, the ground state components of the vector ζ are normalized by the condition

$$\sum_{m_f=-1}^{1}\left|\zeta_{m_f}^{(ground)}\right|^2 = 1. \tag{2}$$

We assume the repulsive interaction of atoms in the BEC, i.e., $c_0 > 0$. For the sake of definiteness, we assume also that $c_2 > 0$. It follows from the latter condition that the ground state of such a system is a so-called polar state [7]. This means that, in the mean field picture, all the atoms have zero momentum projection to a certain axis. This state is degenerate with respect to orientation of this axis. Let this axis be the z-axis, so in the equilibrium, when the time derivative of ψ in Eq.(1) is equal to zero,

$$\zeta_{\pm 1}^{(ground)} = 0, \qquad \zeta_0^{(ground)} = 1.$$

The chemical potential of the BEC in the polar state is $\mu = c_0 n$.

Before writing Eq.(1) in explicit form, we introduce the new unknown functions: $\xi_\pm = (\zeta_1 \pm \zeta_{-1}^*)/\sqrt{2}$, $\eta_p = \mathrm{Re}\,\zeta_0 - 1$, $\eta_i = \mathrm{Im}\,\zeta_0$. Then Eq.(1) can be transformed to the set of equations

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\xi_- &= -\frac{\hbar}{2M}\nabla^2\xi_+ + 2c_2 n\xi_+ + c_0 n(\xi_+^*\xi_+ + \xi_-^*\xi_- + 2\eta_p + \eta_p^2 + \eta_i^2)\xi_+ + \\ &\quad c_2 n[(\xi_+\xi_-^* - \xi_+^*\xi_- + 2\eta_i + 2\eta_p\eta_i)\xi_- + 2(2\eta_p + \eta_p^2)\xi_+], \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\xi_+ &= -\frac{\hbar}{2M}\nabla^2\xi_- + c_0 n(\xi_+^*\xi_+ + \xi_-^*\xi_- + 2\eta_p + \eta_p^2 + \eta_i^2)\xi_- + \\ &\quad c_2 n[(\xi_+\xi_-^* - \xi_+^*\xi_- + 2\eta_i + 2\eta_p\eta_i)\xi_+ + 2\eta_i^2\xi_-], \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\eta_i &= -\frac{\hbar}{2M}\nabla^2\eta_p + 2c_0 n\eta_p + c_0 n[(\xi_+^*\xi_+ + \xi_-^*\xi_- + 3\eta_p + \eta_p^2 + \eta_i^2)\eta_p + \\ &\quad \xi_+^*\xi_+ + \xi_-^*\xi_- + \eta_i^2] + c_2 n[2\xi_+^*\xi_+\eta_p + 2\xi_+^*\xi_+ + (\xi_+^*\xi_- + \xi_+\xi_-^*)\eta_i], \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\eta_p &= -\frac{\hbar}{2M}\nabla^2\eta_i + c_0 n(\xi_+^*\xi_+ + \xi_-^*\xi_- + 2\eta_p + \eta_p^2 + \eta_i^2)\eta_i + \\ &\quad c_2 n[2\xi_-^*\xi_-\eta_i + (\xi_+^*\xi_- + \xi_+\xi_-^*)\eta_p + \xi_+^*\xi_- + \xi_+\xi_-^*]. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

If we neglect all the nonlinear terms in Eqs.(3 — 6), then we get immediately the solutions in the form of plane monochromatic waves and the corresponding dispersion laws [7]. The first mode is the density wave, it corresponds, in the linear approximation, to the periodic oscillations of the $m_f = 0$ component of the order parameter only (i.e., of η_p, η_i), while ξ_+ and ξ_- remain zero. Density waves in a spinor BEC are the same as sound waves in a scalar BEC. The dependence of the frequency ω_{d0} of the density waves on the wavenumber k is of the Bogoliubov's type, $\omega_{d0}^2(k) = \omega_r(k)[\omega_r(k) + 2c_0 n]$, where $\omega_r(k) = \hbar k^2/(2M)$ is the recoil frequency associated with the kinetic momentum $\hbar k$. Another branch of the excitation spectrum in a spinor BEC is related to magnetization waves. Left and right circularly polarized magnetization modes are degenerate and in the linear regime their frequency is given by the formula $\omega_{m0}^2(k) = \omega_r(k)[\omega_r(k) + 2c_2 n]$. The quantum mechanical mean values of the atomic magnetic momentum operator are proportional to the ξ_+ and ξ_+^* for the left and right polarization, respectively.

Now we can determine the effects of nonlinearity on magnetization wave propagation, using the perturbation theory of classical mechanics [10]. Namely, we expand our unknown

functions in series: $\xi_+ = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \xi_+^{(j)}$, where $\xi_+^{(j)}$ is proportional to the j-th power of a certain small parameter ε (in fact, the square of the magnetization amplitude can be naturally regarded as this parameter). Similar expansions hold for the remaining three functions. The zeroth order approximation can be taken also in the form of the plane wave, $\xi_+^{(0)} = A_+ \sin(\omega t - \mathbf{k}\,\mathbf{r})$, but with the frequency ω shifted with respect to the non-perturbed value ω_{m0}. The validity of this method is restricted to the case of small resulting correction to the frequency, $|(\omega - \omega_{m0})/\omega_{m0}| \ll 1$. Also we take $\xi_-^{(0)} = \omega_r(k)^{-1}\omega A_+ \cos(\omega t - \mathbf{k}\,\mathbf{r})$, $\eta_p^{(0)} = 0$, $\eta_i^{(0)} = 0$. The difference between ω and ω_{m0} can be also represented as a series in ε, beginning from the term of order of ε^1.

To find the correction to the frequency of a magnetization wave, we make the following transformation of our set of GPEs. We add to and substract from the right-hand side of Eq.(3) the term $\omega^2\xi_+/\omega_r(k)$. Then we note that our zeroth order approximation satisfies the set of equations $-\partial\xi_-/\partial t = \omega^2\xi_+/\omega_r(k)$, $\partial\xi_+/\partial t = \omega_r(k)\xi_-$ identically. The remaining terms must be regarded as a perturbation leading to the frequency shift in higher orders of approximation. Eqs.(3 — 6) must be satisfied in every order in ε separately, i.e., one must group all the terms of order of ε^j in the right-hand side and equalize them to the $O(\varepsilon^j)$ part of the left-hand side of the equation. We restrict our analysis to the linear order in ε when we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
-\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\xi_-^{(1)} &= \frac{\omega^2}{\omega_r(k)}\xi_+^{(1)} + \Big\{\omega_r(k) + 2c_2 n - \frac{\omega^2}{\omega_r(k)}\Big\}^{(1)} A_+ \sin(\omega t - \mathbf{k}\,\mathbf{r}) + \\
&\quad c_0 n\Big[\sin^2(\omega t - \mathbf{k}\,\mathbf{r}) + \frac{\omega^2}{\omega_r^2(k)}\cos^2(\omega t - \mathbf{k}\,\mathbf{r})\Big] A_+^3 \sin(\omega t - \mathbf{k}\,\mathbf{r}), \qquad (7)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\xi_+^{(1)} &= \omega_r(k)\xi_-^{(1)} + \frac{\omega}{\omega_r(k)} c_0 n\Big[\sin^2(\omega t - \mathbf{k}\,\mathbf{r}) + \frac{\omega^2}{\omega_r^2(k)}\cos^2(\omega t - \mathbf{k}\,\mathbf{r})\Big] \times \\
&\quad A_+^3 \cos(\omega t - \mathbf{k}\,\mathbf{r}). \qquad (8)
\end{aligned}
$$

Here the symbol $\{\,...\,\}^{(1)}$ means that only linear in $\varepsilon \sim A_+^2$ contribution to the expression in the curly brackets is retained. A_+ is taken to be real, without loss of generality.

Eqs.(7, 8) can be easily reduced to the following differential equation

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial^2}{\partial t^2}\xi_+^{(1)} + \omega^2\xi_+^{(1)} + \Big\{\omega_{m0}^2 - \omega^2 + \frac{c_0 n\omega_r(k)}{4}\Big[3 + 4\frac{\omega^2}{\omega_r^2(k)} + 3\frac{\omega^4}{\omega_r^4(k)}\Big] A_+^2\Big\}^{(1)} \times \\
&\qquad A_+ \sin(\omega t - \mathbf{k}\,\mathbf{r}) + C A_+^3 \sin[3(\omega t - \mathbf{k}\,\mathbf{r})] = 0. \qquad (9)
\end{aligned}
$$

Here C is a certain combination of various frequency parameters of the problem; its calculation is not needed for determination of the correction to the wave frequency in the lowest order.

Eq.(9) is inhomogeneous, and the presence of resonant source term proportional to $\sin(\omega t - \mathbf{k}\,\mathbf{r})$ leads to occurrence of oscillations with amplitude growing linearly in time in the solution for $\xi_+^{(1)}$. And the very essence of the method used here [10] is avoiding of these non-physical (secular) solutions proportional to $t\sin(\omega t - \mathbf{k}\,\mathbf{r})$ by setting the prefactor of the resonant term to zero. Thus, to the lowest order in square of the wave amplitude, the magnetization wave frequency is given by the expression

$$
\omega^2 = \omega_{m0}^2 + \frac{c_0 n\omega_r(k)}{4}\Big[3 + 4\frac{\omega_{m0}^2}{\omega_r^2(k)} + 3\frac{\omega_{m0}^4}{\omega_r^4(k)}\Big] A_+^2. \qquad (10)
$$

In the two limiting cases (of the short and long wavelength) we obtain

$$\omega^2 = \omega_r^2(k) + \frac{5}{4}u_0^2 k^2 A_+^2, \qquad \hbar k \gg M u_2, \tag{11}$$

and

$$\omega^2 = u_2^2 k^2 + 6u_0^2 k^2 \left(\frac{M u_2}{\hbar k}\right)^4 A_+^2, \qquad \hbar k \ll M u_2, \tag{12}$$

respectively. Here $u_F = \sqrt{\hbar c_F n/M}$ are the velocities of propagation of density ($F = 0$) and magnetization ($F = 2$) waves of infinitely small amplitude in the long wavelength limit. So we can conclude that the effects of nonlinearity are small until

$$A_+^2 \ll 1, \qquad \hbar k \gg M u_0, \tag{13}$$

$$A_+^2 \ll \left(\frac{\hbar k}{M u_0}\right)^2, \qquad M u_2 \lesssim \hbar k \lesssim M u_0, \tag{14}$$

$$A_+^2 \ll \frac{c_2}{c_0}\left(\frac{\hbar k}{M u_2}\right)^4, \qquad \hbar k \ll M u_2. \tag{15}$$

This is interesting that the condition of the nonlinearity smallness coincides with the trivial condition of smallness of A_+^2 in comparison to the sum of squares of absolute values of all the three $\zeta_{m_f}^{(ground)}$ in the ground state which is unity, according to Eq.(2), only in the short wavelength limit of Eq.(13). In the other other cases [Eqs.(14, 15)], even small but finite excitation amplitude can result in a significant modification of the wave propagation.

It is easy to show that Eqs.(5, 6), in the case of magnetization waves, have no resonant terms in their right-hand sides in the first order in ε and hence do not contribute to the evaluation of the corresponding correction to the wave frequency.

Density waves can be analyzed in the similar way, and the lowest-order correction results in the formula

$$\omega^2 = \omega_{d0}^2 + \frac{3}{4}c_0 n \omega_r(k) A_p^2, \tag{16}$$

where A_p is the amplitude of oscillations of η_p. For all the momenta k, the correction is small provided that $A_p \ll 1$, i.e., nonlinear effects play less role for waves of this type, in contrary to magnetization waves. Eq.(16) also applies to sound waves in a single-component (scalar) BEC.

Since ω_{m0} does not depend on c_0 but the latter quantity appears in the right-hand side of Eq.(10), we conclude that nonlinear coupling to density waves plays the key role in modification of the magnetization wave frequency. In opposite, Eq.(16) does not contain c_2, so a traveling density wave is not coupled to magnetization modes.

Now let us discuss briefly the case of a mixture of two BECs each having the fixed value of m_f or, equivalently, of two scalar BECs. Here we need first to introduce the coupling constants $g_{j'j} = 2\pi\hbar a_{j'j}(M_j + M_{j'})/(M_j M_{j'})$, where M_j is the mass of an atom of the j-th kind, $a_{j'j}$ is the s-wave scattering length for a pair of atoms of j-th and j'-th kind, j', $j = 1, 2$. The dispersion laws for the two excitation branches were obtained in the analytic form in Ref.[6] (see also Ref.[5]). If all the three relevant scattering lengths are positive, the criterion of stability of a homogeneous BEC mixture against phase separation

is simply $g_{12} < \sqrt{g_{11}g_{22}}$. In this case, the eigenmode frequencies are positive for all the values of the momentum k. For the sake of simplicity, we consider in our paper the case of equal atomic masses, $M_1 = M_2 \equiv M$. Then the eigenfrequencies are simply $\omega_\pm^2 = \omega_r(k)[\omega_r(k) + 2\Lambda_\pm]$, where $\Lambda_\pm = [g_{11}n_1 + g_{22}n_2 \pm \sqrt{(g_{11}n_1 - g_{22}n_2)^2 + 4g_{12}^2 n_1 n_2}\,]/2$, n_1, n_2 are the equilibrium number densities of the components, $\omega_r(k)$ is the same quantity as defined above.

The order parameter perturbation for the j-th component reads as $\delta\psi_j = \sqrt{n_1}A_j[\sin(\omega t - \mathbf{k}\,\mathbf{r}) + i\omega_r^{-1}(k)\omega\cos(\omega t - \mathbf{k}\,\mathbf{r})]$. After some tedious but straightforward calculations, analogous to those described above and valid under the same condition of smallness of the frequency correction, we arrive at the following formula for the shifted, due to the nonlinearity effects, wave frequency:

$$\omega^2 = \omega_\pm^2 + \frac{\omega_r(k)g_\pm n_1}{2}\Big[3 + 4\frac{\omega_\pm^2}{\omega_r^2(k)} + 3\frac{\omega_\pm^4}{\omega_r^4(k)}\Big]B_\pm^2. \tag{17}$$

Here the upper sign corresponds to the case of $B_+ \neq 0$, $B_- = 0$, and the lower sign corresponds to the opposite case, $B_+ = 0$, $B_- \neq 0$. Here the eigenmode amplitudes are defined as

$$B_+ = \cos\theta_g\, A_1 + \sqrt{\frac{n_2}{n_1}}\sin\theta_g\, A_2, \qquad B_- = -\sin\theta_g\, A_1 + \sqrt{\frac{n_2}{n_1}}\cos\theta_g\, A_2. \tag{18}$$

Also we set by definition

$$g_+ = g_{11}\cos^4\theta_g + 2g_{12}\cos^2\theta_g\,\sin^2\theta_g + g_{22}\sin^4\theta_g, \tag{19}$$

$$g_- = g_{11}\sin^4\theta_g + g_{22}\cos^4\theta_g, \tag{20}$$

$$\tan\theta_g = \frac{g_{22}n_2 - g_{11}n_1 + \sqrt{(g_{22}n_2 - g_{11}n_1)^2 + 4g_{12}^2 n_1 n_2}}{2g_{12}\sqrt{n_1 n_2}}. \tag{21}$$

Eq.(17) is of the form similar to Eq.(10) and leads to similar restriction on the wave amplitude. If we the two BECs are composed of atoms accumulated on two different magnetic or hyperfine sublevels of the ground internal state, the difference between g_{12} and $\sqrt{g_{11}g_{22}}$ is relatively small, and the lower-frequency mode is extremely sensitive to the effects of nonlinearity in the long wavelength limit. One should note that both the branches of excitation spectrum of a two-component BEC in an external magnetic field are sensitive to nonlinear effects for small k's, while the spinor BEC collective excitations exhibit different behaviour: the nonlinearity effects are important for magnetization waves much more than for density waves.

In summary, we should note that the studied effects of nonlinearity in wave propagation in a BEC are related to the Beliaev damping [11] (cf. the closely related recent publication [12] on an efficient damping of a relative motion of two condensates in a trap by nonlinear interaction). The Beliaev damping is also described the cubic nonlinear term in the GPE. It is, in fact, decay of a quantum of collective excitation to two quata of lower energies, provided that the energy and momentum are conserved. This process results in occurrence of an imaginary part of the wave frequency (the damping constant). We calculate in the present paper the real small addend to the wave frequency. While the

Beliaev damping becomes less important when k approaches zero, the nonlinear corrections to the magnetization mode in a spinor BEC and to both of the modes in an usual two-component BEC become more pronounced.

Finally, we present a numerical example. The ground state of a spinor BEC of sodium atoms with $f = 1$ is just a polar (antiferromagnetic) state [2]. We take $(a_0+2a_2)/3 \approx 5$ nm, $(a_2 - a_0)/3 \approx 0.08$ nm and set $n \approx 10^{14}$ cm^{-3}. Let the excitation wavenumber be of about $3.5 \cdot 10^3$ cm^{-1} (the corresponding wavelength is several times smaller than the atomic cloud size in an experiment with large number of atoms in a trap like that of Ref.[2], so the WKB approximation still remains satisfactory). For $A_+ \to 0$ the linear theory [7] gives the magnetization wave frequency $\omega_{m0} \approx 300$ s^{-1}. However, if $A_+ \approx 0.044$, in other words, only $[1 + \omega_r^{-2}(k)\omega^2]A_+^2/2 \approx 0.005$ of the total mass of the BEC is involved into the motion, then the frequency rises by one-third of its primary value and becomes equal to 400 s^{-1}, according to Eq.(10). Similarly, one can expect a strongly nonlinear behaviour of low-lying magnetization modes of a spinor BEC in an optical trap of a finite size, since the trapped BEC spectrum ought to reveal the most important qualitative features present in the translationally invariant case, as it has been shown for two-component BECs in magnetic traps [5].

This work is supported by the NWO, project NWO–047–009.010, the state program "Universities of Russia", grant 015.01.01.04, and the Ministry of Education of Russia, grant E00–3–12.

References

[1] C.J. Myatt, E.A. Burt, R.W. Ghirst, E.A. Cornell, C.E. Wieman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 586, (1997); D.S. Hall, M.R. Matthews, J.R. Ensher, C.E. Wieman, E.A. Cornell, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 1539 (1998).

[2] J.Stenger, S. Inouye, D.M. Stamper-Kurn, H.-J. Miesner, A.P. Chikkatur, W. Ketterle, Nature, **396**, 345 (1998).

[3] M.D. Barrett, J.A. Sauer, M.S. Chapman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 010404 (2001).

[4] T.-L. Ho, V.B. Shenoy, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 3276 (1996).

[5] R. Graham, D. Walls, Phys. Rev. A, **57**, 484 (1998); B.D. Esry, C.H. Greene, Phys. Rev. A, **57**, 1265 (1998); D. Gordon, C.M. Savage, Phys. Rev. A, **58**, 1440 (1998).

[6] Yu.A. Nepomnyashchii, Sov. Phys. JETP, **43**, 559 (1976).

[7] T.-L. Ho, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 742 (1998); T. Ohmi, K. Machida, J. Phys. Soc. Japan, **67**, 1822 (1998).

[8] Th. Busch, J.R. Anglin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 010401 (2001).

[9] Y. Castin, R. Dum, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 5315 (1996); Yu. Kagan, E.L. Surkov, G.V. Shlyapnikov, Pys. Rev. A, **54**, R1753 (1996).

[10] A.H. Nayfeh, *"Perturbation Methods"*, (Wiley, NY, 1973); L.D. Landau, E.M. Lifshitz, *"Mechanics"*, (Pergamon, Oxford, 1988).

[11] S.T. Beliaev, Sov. Phys. JETP, **34**, 323 (1958).

[12] A. Sinatra, P.O. Fedichev, Y. Castin, J. Dalibard, G.V. Shlyapnikov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 251 (1999).